

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-13 and 15-21 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 2, 7-8, 10 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 15-18 are withdrawn as being directed to non-elected claims. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

The Abstract, specification and claims have been revised to correct informalities and grammatical errors and to clarify the invention according to U.S. practice. These modifications do not add any new matter to the disclosure and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Objection

In view of the cancellation of claims 7 and 10 only to expedite prosecution, the objection to these claims is moot and must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 8 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been canceled and claim 13 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, this rejection must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 and 12-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brady (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,287). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 9, the Examiner equates Brady's CLS gateway 103a to Applicant's PSTN gateway, and Brady's CLS gateway 103 (103a or 103b) or the link server 105a to Applicant's inter-gateway.

First, Brady's CLS gateway 103 (i.e., 103a or 103b) is a PSTN gateway and performs differently from Applicant's inter-gateway.

Second, Brady's link server 105a receives a voice signal of a telephone 108a from a PBX 104a and transmits it to a remote terminal through the Internet. On the other hand, conventional telephone calls are processed by the PBX 104a and the gateway 103a.

In contrast, in Applicant's embodied invention as shown in Fig. 1, when the PSTN terminal 10A performs voice communication with a remote terminal of a different area, a voice signal of the PSTN terminal 10A is transmitted through both the PSTN gateway terminal 30A and then the inter-gateway 40A to the Internet. Here, the voice signal of the PSTN terminal 10A is packetized by the PSTN gateway 30a and then compressed by the inter-gateway 40A before being transmitted over the Internet to a remote terminal. On the other

hand, local communication between the PSTN terminals 10A and the IP terminals 20A-1...20A-N are made through the PSTN gateway 30A without the use of the inter-gateway 40A, by communicating uncompressed voice packets over the LAN. According to the present invention, since the communication speed of the LAN is fast, the voice packets transmitted and received between the terminals and PSTN gateway 30A are not compressed, whereas since the speed of the Internet may be slower than the LAN, the voice packets transmitted and received between the inter-gateways 40A and 40B over the Internet are compressed so as to improve transmission rate of data. This is one of the advantages of the present invention.

Clearly, these features are completely absent from Brady. Therefore, Brady does not anticipate, *inter alia*:

wherein voice packets from the IP terminals connected with the LAN are transmitted to the remote terminals through the inter-gateway after being compressed,

voice signals from the PSTN terminals connected with the PSTN are packetized by the PSTN gateway and transmitted to the remote terminals through the inter-gateway after being compressed, and

the PSTN terminals and the IP terminals communicate with each other by uncompressed voice packets through the PSTN gateway

as recited in independent claim 1; and

wherein voice packets from the at least one IP terminal are transmitted to one or more of the remote terminals through the inter-gateway after being compressed,

voice signals from the at least one PSTN terminal

are packetized by the PSTN gateway and transmitted to one or more of the remote terminals through the inter-gateway after being compressed, and

the at least one PSTN terminal and the at least one IP terminal communicate with each other by uncompressed voice packets through the PSTN gateway

as recited in independent claim 9.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over Brady, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 4, 5, 11 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady in view of Cave et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,746). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed hereinabove, Brady does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features recited in independent claims 1 and 9 from which claims 4, 5 and 11 depend (claim 14 is cancelled). Furthermore, Cave et al. does not overcome this deficiency since Cave et al. is merely relied on for transmitting compressed signals over the Internet and lacks the specifics of the claimed features.

Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as

recited in independent claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 19-21 further define the invention recited in independent claims 1 and 9 and are thus allowable at least for the same reasons that their independent claims are allowable as discussed herein. In the alternative, these new claims emphasize the distinguishing features of the invention over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538
for James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

JTE/EHC:lmh

Attachments: Abstract of the Disclosure
Substitute Specification
Marked-Up Copy of Sub. Specification